Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
AUG 2 5 2015
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 14-916

In the Supreme Court of the United States

KINGDOMWARE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
RESPONDENT

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE AMERICAN LEGION AS *AMICUS CURIAE* SUPPORTING PETITIONER

LINDA T. COBERLY
Winston & Strawn LLP
35 W. Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 558-5600

ANDREW C. NICHOLS
Counsel of Record
STEFFEN N. JOHNSON
EIMERIC REIG-PLESSIS
Winston & Strawn LLP
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 282-5000
anichols@winston.com

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

QUESTION PRESENTED

The Veterans Benefits, Health Care, and Information Technology Act of 2006 provides that contracting officers at the Department of Veterans Affairs "shall award" contracts on the basis of competition restricted to small businesses owned by veterans whenever there is a "reasonable expectation" that two or more such businesses will bid for the contract at "a fair and reasonable price that offers best value to the United States." 38 U.S.C. §8127(d). Citing the Act's prefatory clause, however, the Federal Circuit limited the application of this mandate to situations in which the Department believes that applying it is necessary to meet the goals that the Department establishes for contracting with veteran-owned small businesses.

The question presented is:

Whether the Federal Circuit erred in construing 38 U.S.C. §8127(d)'s mandatory set-aside restricting competition for Department of Veterans Affairs' contracts to veteran-owned small businesses as discretionary.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

INTRODUCTION AND INTEREST OF *AMICUS CURIAE* 1

STATEMENT 2

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 5

ARGUMENT 7

I. The decision below violates this Court's "long applied" rule that statutes must be construed "for the benefit of the veteran." 7

II. Under settled precedent, prefatory clauses cannot trump operative statutory language. 14

III. The decision below is contrary to Congress's intent of maximizing economic opportunities for our Nation's veterans 21

A. The VA's persistent refusal to obey Congress's command diverts from veterans up to $10 billion every year. 21

B. Confirming Kingdomware's plain reading of the statute, Congress strove to overcome the VA's recalcitrance by strengthening the law *three times*. 23

CONCLUSION 24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

Ass'n of Am. R.R. v. *Costle*,
562 F.2d 1310 (D.C. Cir. 1977) 19

Atl. Richfield Co. v. *United States*,
764 F.2d 837 (Fed. Cir. 1985)..... 19

Boone v. *Lightner*,
319 U.S. 561 (1943) 7, 10, 13

Brown v. *Gardner*,
513 U.S. 115 (1994) 6, 8, 10-13

Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. *Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*,
467 U.S. 837 (1984) 5

City of Joliet, Ill. v. *New West, L.P.*,
562 F.3d 830 (7th Cir. 2009) 20

CMS Contract Mgmt. Servs. v. *United States*,
745 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 20

Coffy v. *Republic Steel Corp.*,
447 U.S. 191 (1980) 7, 13

Crawford v. *Burke*,
195 U.S. 176 (1904) 24

District of Columbia v. *Heller*,
554 U.S. 570 (2008) 6, 16-17

Escoe v. *Zerbst*,
295 U.S. 490 (1935) 15

Fishgold v. *Sullivan Drydock & Repair Corp.*,
328 U.S. 275 (1946) 8, 13

Florentine v. *Church of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel*,
340 F.2d 239 (2d Cir. 1965)..... 19

Hawaii v. *Office of Haw. Affairs*,
556 U.S. 163 (2009) 6-7, 17

Henderson ex rel. Henderson v. *Shinseki*,
562 U.S. 428 (2011) 6-7, 9, 11, 13-14

Hooper v. *Bernalillo Cnty. Assessor*,
472 U.S. 612 (1985) 13-14

In re Aldevra,
2011 WL 4826148 (Comp. Gen. Oct. 11, 2011) 4, 20

In re Aldevra,
2012 WL 860813 (Comp. Gen. Mar. 14, 2012) .. 20

Jurgensen v. *Fairfax Cnty., Va.*,
745 F.2d 868 (4th Cir. 1984) 19

King v. *St. Vincent's Hosp.*,
502 U.S. 215 (1991) 5, 7-8, 10, 13

Kingdomware Techs.—Reconsideration,
2012 WL 6463498 (Comp. Gen. Dec. 13, 2012) 22

Lexecon Inc. v. *Milberg Weiss Bershad Hynes & Lerach*,
523 U.S. 26 (1998) 15

Lopez v. *Davis*,
531 U.S. 230 (2001) 15

Mach Mining, LLC v. *E.E.O.C.*,
135 S. Ct. 1645 (2015) 15

Nat'l Wildlife Found. v. *Marsh*,
721 F.2d 767 (11th Cir. 1983) 19

Parish Oil Co. v. *Dillon Cos.*,
523 F.3d 1244 (10th Cir. 2008) 19

Regan v. *Taxation with Representation*,
461 U.S. 540 (1983) 7, 13

Russello v. *United States*,
464 U.S. 16 (1983) 24

Scialabba v. *Cuellar de Osorio*,
134 S. Ct. 2191 (2014) 17

Shinseki v. *Sanders*,
556 U.S. 396 (2009) 13

United States v. *Rodgers*,
461 U.S. 677 (1983) 24

United States v. *White*,
2012 WL 4513489 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 2, 2012) ... 10-11

Util. Air Regulatory Grp. v. *EPA*,
134 S. Ct. 2427 (2014) 18

White v. *United States*,
543 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 19

Yazoo & M.V.R. Co. v. *Thomas*,
132 U.S. 174 (1889) 18

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

15 U.S.C.

§644 2

§657f 3, 23

38 U.S.C.

§1151 12

§8127 ..... 3-5, 8, 12, 15, 24

Pub. L. No. 106-50, 113 Stat. 233 2

Pub. L. No. 108-183, 117 Stat. 2651 2

Pub. L. No. 109-461, 120 Stat. 3403 3

OTHER AUTHORITIES

48 C.F.R. §819.7003(d) 6, 10

GAO Report to Congress, 2012 WL 5510908 (Comp. Gen. Nov. 13, 2012) 4, 21

Miller, Kathleen, *Dispute Simmers Between VA and Veteran-Owned Businesses*, Wash. Post, 2011 WLNR 23483727 (Nov. 14, 2011)..... 22

Scalia, A. & Garner, B., *Reading Law* (2012)..... 16

Sedgwick, T., *A Treatise on the Rules which Govern the Interpretation and Construction of Statutory and Constitutional Law* (2d ed. 1874) 18

Sherman, P., *Paved with Good Intentions: Obstacles to Meeting Federal Contracting Goals for Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses*, 36 Pub. Cont. L.J. 125 (2006)..... 2, 14, 23

Small Business Administration, *Veteran-owned Businesses and their Owners—Data from the Census Bureau's Survey of Business Owners* (Mar. 2012)..... 21

Sutherland Statutes & Statutory Constr. (7th ed. 2013)..... 18

Williams, J.T., *Veterans First? VA Should Give Vet Contracting Program Priority*, 47-WTR Procurement Law. (2012)..... 22

INTRODUCTION AND INTEREST OF *AMICUS CURIAE*

In a decision that eviscerates the rights of 2.5 million veteran-owned businesses to participate in an important government contract program, a divided panel of the Federal Circuit violated this Court's precedent and Congress's command that veterans "shall" participate in the program. That word was chosen carefully. It was enacted in a *third* revision directed specifically to the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA") after it failed to heed Congress's first two enactments, which were permissive. Reversal is needed because the Federal Circuit's decision flouts two of this Court's critical canons of statutory construction—one of which is specially tailored to veterans—and contravenes the expressly stated intent of Congress. In the process, the court below snuffed out the rights of veterans to contracts estimated at up to $10 billion per year.

These rights could hardly be more important to the American Legion's three million members. Chartered by Congress in 1919, the American Legion is a community-service organization that routinely assists veterans in matters involving the VA. Among other services, the American Legion helps veterans transition to the civilian economy. This is the same critical transition that Congress sought to ease with the statutory rights here, which have now been destroyed by the VA and the majority below.

---

* The parties have consented to the filing of this brief, and their letters of consent are on file with the Clerk. See R. 37.3(a). No counsel for any party has authored this brief in whole or in part, and no person or entity, other than *amicus* and its counsel, has made a monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief. See R. 37.6.

STATEMENT

1. This case involves the third of three attempts by Congress to compel federal agencies to favor veterans in awarding government contracts. In its first attempt, the Veterans Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development Act (the "1999 Act"), Congress set an annual goal that at least three percent of contracts be awarded to service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses, and required that agencies falling short of this goal "justif[y]" their failure. 15 U.S.C. §644(g), (h). As Congress explained, it had "done too little to assist veterans, particularly service-disabled veterans, in playing a greater role in the economy * * * by forming and expanding small business enterprises." Pub. L. No. 106-50 §101(3). Although the vote was unanimous, some groups, including the American Legion, expressed concern that it did not go far enough. See P. Sherman, *Paved with Good Intentions: Obstacles to Meeting Federal Contracting Goals for Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses*, 36 Pub. Cont. L.J. 125, 130 (2006).

The American Legion proved to be right. It quickly became clear that the 1999 Act was a failure, as agencies fell far short of the three percent goal. Pet. App. 4a. In fact, from 2001 to 2002, the percentage of contracts awarded to service-disabled veteran-owned businesses *fell*—from 0.22 percent to a mere 0.12 percent. Sherman, *supra*, at 131.

2. In response to the 1999 Act's failure, Congress passed the Veterans Benefits Act of 2003 (the "2003 Act"), which gave agencies substantial flexibility to favor veterans. The 2003 Act provided that an agency "*may* award" a contract while restricting competi-

tion to service-disabled veteran-owned businesses. 15 U.S.C. §657f(b) (emphasis added). The only stipulation was what is known as the "Rule of Two"—namely, that the agency have "a reasonable expectation that not less than 2 [such businesses] will submit offers and that the award can be made at a fair market price." *Ibid.* This flexible approach failed, too. By 2005, service-disabled veteran-owned businesses were receiving barely a half percent of contracts. Pet. App. 5a.

3. Determined to solve the problem, Congress returned to the drawing board in 2006, this time drafting a law (i) with mandatory provisions, (ii) benefiting all veteran-owned small businesses, and (iii) focusing on the VA, which should "set the example among government agencies." Pet. App. 5a-6a, 16a. The result was the Veterans Benefits, Health Care, and Information Technology Act of 2006 (the "2006 Act"), which, with certain exceptions, requires the VA to award contracts to veteran-owned small businesses whenever the Rule of Two is met:

> Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), for purposes of meeting the goals under subsection (a), and in accordance with this section, a contracting officer of the [VA] ***shall award*** contracts on the basis of competition restricted to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans if the contracting officer has a reasonable expectation that two or more small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans will submit offers[.]

38 U.S.C. §8127(d) (emphasis added). By contrast, the exceptions in subsections (b) and (c) are discretionary, providing that the VA "*may* use" other

procedures or "*may* award" contracts to other businesses (assuming certain conditions apply). *Id.* §§8127(b), (c) (emphasis added).

4. Despite the command that the VA "shall" set aside contracts where the Rule of Two is met, the VA refused. Between 2011 and 2012, the Government Accountability Office ("GAO") sustained 18 bid protests on the ground that the VA awarded contracts to non-veterans without applying the Rule of Two. GAO Report to Congress, 2012 WL 5510908, at *1 (Comp. Gen. Nov. 13, 2012). In sustaining the protests, the GAO held that the law's set-aside is "unequivocal" and that "nothing in the [2006] Act * * * provides the agency with discretion" to defy it. *In re Aldevra*, 2011 WL 4826148, at *2 (Comp. Gen. Oct. 11, 2011). Undeterred, the VA announced that it would continue to treat the set-aside as optional. GAO Report to Congress, 2012 WL 5510908, at *4.

5. One of the contractors affected by the VA's intransigence is petitioner, Kingdomware Technologies, a service-disabled veteran-owned small business. Pet. App. 2a. In 2012, the VA awarded a contract for an emergency notification system, a product offered by Kingdomware, to a non-veteran vendor. *Id.* at 9a-10a. Kingdomware filed a protest with the GAO, showing that §8127(d) required the VA to examine whether the contract should have been set aside for veteran-owned small businesses. *Ibid.*

The GAO agreed with Kingdomware, but the VA refused to follow the GAO's recommendations. *Id.* at 10a. Unable to obtain relief, Kingdomware filed a complaint in the U.S. Court of Federal Claims (*id.* at 11a), which found the statute "ambiguous" and deferred to the VA's interpretation as "reasonable" un-

der *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc.* v. *Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837, 843-844 (1984).

6. A divided panel of the Federal Circuit affirmed, but without finding §8127(d) ambiguous. Rather, the majority held that the statute's prefatory clause—"for purposes of meeting the goals under subsection (a)"—"unambiguously" grants the VA "discretion" to pass over veteran-owned small businesses when it decides that it can meet its goals. Pet. App. 15a, 17a-20a (Clevenger, J., joined by Prost, C.J.). According to the majority, if the purpose statement did *not* limit the operative clause (ordering that the VA "shall" prefer veterans), the purpose statement would be "superfluous." *Id.* at 20a.

In a forceful dissent, Judge Reyna showed that the "plain language of the 2006 Veterans Act unambiguously requires" the VA to award contracts to veteran-owned small businesses "in every acquisition" that meets the Rule of Two. *Id.* at 22a. Thus, the majority was wrong "[t]o override the [law's] clear imperative" by "rel[ying] on [its] prefatory language," because "a mandate * * * cannot be limited by its prologue." *Id.* at 26a.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The panel majority's reasoning violates two controlling canons of statutory construction established by this Court. It also flouts the statute's plain language, which Congress strengthened three times.

First, as we explain in Section I (*infra* at 7-14), it is a "basic rule[] of statutory construction" that "provisions for benefits to members of the Armed Services are to be construed in the beneficiaries' favor." *King* v. *St. Vincent's Hosp.*, 502 U.S. 215, 220-221, n.9 (1991). To be sure, the statute here is clear. "Shall"

means shall. And the VA's own regulation confirms this very point. But even if the purpose clause created some doubt, and even in the face of a conflicting regulation by the VA, any "interpretive doubt" still would have to "be resolved in the veteran's favor." *Brown* v. *Gardner*, 513 U.S. 115, 118 (1994); see also *Henderson ex rel. Henderson* v. *Shinseki*, 562 U.S. 428, 441 (2011) (same).

Unable to contest the importance of this "longstanding canon," the government resorts to arguing that "Section 8127 is not a benefits statute." Opp. 21 n.5. Yet Congress itself called the set-aside here a "benefit" in the very name of the statute—the "Veterans *Benefits*, Health Care, and Information Technology Act of 2006." And the VA calls it a "benefit" in its own regulation. 48 C.F.R. §819.7003(d) ("Any [veteran-owned business] must meet the requirements * * * to receive a *benefit* under this program.") (emphasis added). Thus, even if this Court's pro-veteran canon were limited to formally designated "benefits statutes" (as we will show, it is not), the canon would apply here with full force.

Second, as the dissent below showed, "a prefatory clause does not limit or expand the scope of the operative clause." Although the dissent relied for this point on *District of Columbia* v. *Heller*, 554 U.S. 570 (2008), which involved the Constitution, this Court applies the principle to all "federal legislation." *Hawaii* v. *Office of Haw. Affairs*, 556 U.S. 163, 175 (2009). "As we recently explained in a different context, 'where the text of a clause itself indicates that it does not have operative effect, such as "whereas" clauses in federal legislation * * * a court has no license to make it do what it was not designed to do.'" *Ibid.* (quoting *Heller*, 554 U.S. at 578 n.3). "Rather

than focusing on the operative words," the majority here "directed its attention to the * * * clause[] that preface[s]" them, leading it to a "conclusion [that] is wrong." 556 U.S. at 175. See Section II (*infra* at 14-21).

Finally, reversal is needed to protect the express statutory rights of millions of veteran-owned businesses. See Section III (*infra* at 21-24). Left uncorrected, the decision below will rob veterans of billions of dollars of contracts each year—in violation of Congress's plain intent. That thwarts "[o]ur country['s] * * * long standing policy of compensating veterans," as they "have been obliged to drop their own affairs and take up the burdens of the nation." *Regan* v. *Taxation with Representation*, 461 U.S. 540, 550-551 (1983). Reversal is needed to protect the vital economic opportunities that Congress sought to secure three times.

ARGUMENT

I. The decision below violates this Court's "long applied" rule that statutes must be construed "for the benefit of the veteran."

The Court should reverse, first, because the decision below cannot be reconciled with this Court's "long applied * * * 'canon that provisions for benefits to members of the Armed Services are to be construed in the beneficiaries' favor.'" *Henderson*, 562 U.S. at 441 (Veterans' Judicial Review Act) (quoting *King*, 502 U.S. at 220-221 n.9). Under this canon, statutes are "always to be liberally construed to protect [veterans], who have been obliged to drop their own affairs to take up the burdens of the nation." *Boone* v. *Lightner*, 319 U.S. 561, 575 (1943); *Coffy* v. *Republic Steel Corp.*, 447 U.S. 191, 196 (1980) (same). That is,

courts must adopt "as liberal a construction for the benefit of the veteran as * * * [the statute] permits." *Fishgold* v. *Sullivan Drydock & Repair Corp.*, 328 U.S. 275, 285 (1946).

A court's task "is to construe the separate provisions of the [statute] as parts of an organic whole and give each as liberal a construction for the benefit of the veteran as a harmonious interplay of the separate provisions permits." *Ibid.* Any "interpretive doubt" must "be resolved in the veteran's favor." *Gardner*, 513 U.S. at 118.

1. The decision below contradicts this "basic rule[] of statutory construction." *King*, 502 U.S. at 574 n.9. To be sure, the statute here yields no "interpretive doubt." *Gardner*, 513 U.S. at 118. As the dissent noted, the "plain language" of the statute "unambiguously requires" that the VA "shall award" contracts to veteran-owned small businesses "in every acquisition" that meets the Rule of Two. Pet. App. 22a-23a. As its only basis for rejecting that "plain meaning," the majority reasoned that §8127(d)'s "purpose" clause overrides its operative clause whenever the VA decides that it "has met the goals set under §8127(a)." *Id.* at 19a-20a. As Kingdomware shows, that "reading" runs squarely into the principle that "shall" is the language of command. Pet. Br. 29. Further, it runs into the black-letter rule that prefatory clauses must never override the plain meaning of operative clauses. *Infra* at 14-21. And still further, it collides with the very language of the surrounding statutory clauses, which likewise state the statute's purpose but use the contrasting word of permission: "may." Pet. Br. 29-30.

But even assuming that the statute's purpose statement created some "interpretive doubt" (which was the holding of the Claims Court), any such doubt must be resolved "in the beneficiaries' favor." *Henderson*, 562 U.S. at 441. The Federal Circuit's failure even to mention that obligation was inexcusable.

2. As its sole defense, the government asserts that "Section 8127 is not a benefits statute; it is a government-contracting statute." Opp. 21 n.5. But the government cites no authority limiting the pro-veteran canon to "benefits statutes," and *Henderson* confirms that the canon is not so limited. And in any event, the statute here *is* a benefits statute.

We start with *Henderson*, which required construing a statutory time-bar—specifically, by deciding "whether a veteran's failure to file a notice of appeal" to the Veterans Court "within the [statutory] 120-day period" "should be regarded as having 'jurisdictional' consequences." 562 U.S. at 431. The Federal Circuit held that it did, and thus "dismissed [a veteran's] untimely appeal for lack of jurisdiction"—without "allow[ing] equitable tolling of the 120-day deadline," even though the veteran's "illness caused his tardy filing." *Id.* at 433-434.

In reversing the Federal Circuit, this Court relied on the pro-veteran canon: "Particularly in light of this canon, we do not find any clear indication that the 120-day limit was intended to carry the harsh consequences that accompany the jurisdiction tag." *Id.* at 441. In so doing, the Court gave the 120-day time-bar the same treatment as a "provision for benefits" (*ibid.*), even though the time-bar itself did not benefit veterans at all. To the contrary, if anything, the time-bar by definition cut off benefits. Thus,

Henderson teaches that it is immaterial whether a veterans-related statute itself provides "benefits" or even limits them; "interpretive doubt is to be resolved in the veteran's favor." *Gardner*, 513 U.S. at 117-118; see also *King*, 502 U.S. at 220 n.9 (applying canon to statute addressing veterans' right to reemployment as civilians).

Regardless, the statute here plainly *is* a "benefits statute," as it mandates that the VA set aside certain contracts for businesses owned by veterans. Indeed, the VA's own regulation describes the statute as providing a "benefit": "Any [veteran-owned business] must meet the requirements in FAR 19.102(f) to receive a *benefit* under this program." 48 C.F.R. §819.7003(d) (emphasis added). This is common sense. And, indeed, the set-aside was enacted as part of the "Veterans *Benefits*, Health Care, and Information Technology Act of 2006." That name was apt, as the set-aside exists, as do all veterans' benefits, to assist those "who have been obliged to drop their own affairs to take up the burdens of the nation." *Boone*, 319 U.S. at 575.[1]

---

[1] Notably, at least "[f]our U.S. Courts of Appeals have concluded that government contracts that are set aside for disadvantaged or minority-owned businesses fall within the * * * definition of 'government benefits'" in the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines. *United States* v. *White*, 2012 WL 4513489, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 2, 2012) (citing *United States* v. *Maxwell*, 579 F.3d 1282, 1306 (11th Cir. 2009); *United States* v. *Tulio*, 263 F. App'x 258, 260, 263-264 (3d Cir. 2008); *United States* v. *Bros. Constr. Co. of Ohio*, 219 F.3d 300, 317-318 (4th Cir. 2000); *United States* v. *Leahy*, 464 F.3d 773, 790 (7th Cir. 2006)).

Following these precedents, the Southern District of New York has held that "[t]he VA contracts set aside for small businesses owned by veterans and service-disabled veterans fall squarely within the definition of government benefits" because the VA's

Grasping at straws, the government insists that "[n]either petitioner here nor any of the judges below relied upon the canon." Opp. 21 n.5. Not so. As the government itself noted in its opposition brief below, "Kingdomware * * * contend[ed] that veterans' legislation including the 2006 Act should be liberally construed for the benefit of veterans." Resp. Ct. App. Br. 22 n.3. Although "the judges below" did not invoke the canon, that is beside the point. The Federal Circuit majority in *Henderson* did not mention it, either (see 589 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2009)); and the dissent here did not need to, as it found the statute "unambiguous[]" and "plain" and that, in fact, it "could not be clearer." Pet. App. 22a-23a.

3. Nor is it an answer to say that "th[e] canon would not alter the result here because * * * the VA's interpretation * * * and its own regulations would warrant deference." Opp. 21-22 n.5. For one thing, as Kingdomware has shown, the VA's own regulation commands using the Rule of Two. Pet. Br. 46-48. That alone should settle the issue. But even if the government's "interpretation" had been "continuously and consistently" preferred by the VA (Pet. App. 8a), the pro-veteran canon would still control.

That is the lesson of *Gardner*, in which a veteran began suffering pain after receiving surgery at a VA medical facility. 513 U.S. at 116. He sought disabil-

---

set-aside program "is an effort to increase the opportunities for a class of businesses specified by Congress." *Ibid.* (citation omitted). Although this case of course does not involve the Sentencing Guidelines, the sensible reasoning of these cases applies here. Mandating the use of the Rule of Two is an "effort to increase the opportunities for a class of businesses specified by Congress." *Ibid.* It is a benefit.

ity benefits under a statute providing compensation for "'an injury or an aggravation of an injury' that occurs 'as the result of hospitalization, medical or surgical treatment'" that is not attributable to the veteran's "willful misconduct." 38 U.S.C. §1151 (1994). Even though the veteran had committed no willful misconduct, the VA denied his claim, citing its own regulation interpreting the statute implicitly to cover only injuries arising from the VA's own "fault-or-accident." 513 U.S. at 117 & n.2.

In a unanimous decision, this Court held that the VA's interpretation "flies against the plain language of the statutory text." *Id.* at 122. In so holding, the Court rejected the VA's "attempt[] to reveal a fault requirement implicit in the text" on the ground "that fault inheres in the concept of compensable 'injury.'" *Id.* at 117. While acknowledging that "'injury' can of course carry a fault connotation," the Court noted that "it just as certainly need not do so." *Ibid.* Thus, "[t]he most * * * that the [VA] could claim on the basis of th[e] term ['injury'] is the existence of an ambiguity." *Ibid.* And although the VA could not "plausibly make even this claim" given the statute's "clear answer against" it, this Court emphasized that any "ambiguity" would be resolved by "the rule that interpretive doubt is to be resolved in the veteran's favor." *Id.* at 118, 120.

This is an *a fortiori* case under *Gardner*. "Despite the absence from the statutory language of so much as a word about [discretion] on the part of the VA," the majority below adopted a contrived "interpretation[] in attempting to reveal" a grant of discretion "implicit in" the statute's purpose clause. *Id.* at 117. Yet given the operative clause's command that the VA "shall award" contracts to veterans (38 U.S.C.

§8127(d)), "no such inference can be drawn" (513 U.S. at 117). Even if it could, however, "[t]he most" the government "could claim on the basis of th[e] [purpose clause] is the existence of an ambiguity"—which must "be resolved in the veteran's favor." *Id.* at 117-118. Yet the Federal Circuit did not even mention *Gardner*—much less *Henderson*, *King*, *Boone*, *Coffy*, or *Fishgold*. That was reversible error. The Federal Circuit, which has exclusive jurisdiction under the 2006 Act (Pet. 33-34), may not simply ignore this crucial principle of statutory construction.

4. Nor is the pro-veteran canon a mere technicality. It reflects our Nation's collective dedication to care for those who put their lives at risk for the country, a commitment expressed in Congress's labors to strengthen the laws preferring veterans no fewer than three times. *Infra* at 23-24. Simply put, the pro-veteran canon is an expression by this Court of "special solicitude for the veterans' cause." *Shinseki* v. *Sanders*, 556 U.S. 396, 412 (2009). As "[v]eterans have been obliged to drop their own affairs and take up the burdens of the nation," Congress "has a long standing policy of compensating veterans for their past contributions by providing them with numerous advantages." *Regan*, 461 U.S. at 550-551. As the pro-veteran canon shows, so has this Court.

"The justification for providing a special benefit for veterans," moreover, "has been recognized throughout the history of our country." *Hooper* v. *Bernalillo Cnty. Assessor*, 472 U.S. 612, 626 (1985) (Stevens, J., joined by Rehnquist, J., and O'Connor, J., dissenting). Aside from "expressing * * * gratitude for services that often entail hardship, hazard, and separation from family and friends, and that may be vital to the continued security of our Nation"—which

"itself [is] an adequate justification"—this Court and Congress alike have recognized "that military service typically disrupts the normal progress of civilian employment." *Ibid.*

That indisputable fact "justifies * * * benefits-employment preferences," like the one at issue here, which are designed "to facilitate the reentry into civilian society." *Ibid.* As scholars have recognized, that policy dates back to "the Revolutionary War," when "the Continental Congress" first established "veterans benefit packages." Sherman, *supra*, at 126. Since then, Congress has "recognized an obligation to provide economic assistance to its military veterans," much of which has "focused on assisting veterans in reentering the workforce and starting small businesses." *Ibid.*

In short, both the statute here and this Court's pro-veteran canon stem from these time-honored national policies. The court below ignored this "solicitude of Congress for veterans," which "is of long standing." *Henderson*, 562 U.S. at 440 (quotations omitted). This Court should reaffirm its pro-veteran canon and reverse the judgment below.

II. Under settled precedent, prefatory clauses cannot trump operative statutory language.

As the dissent below emphasized, this Court's precedents make clear that "a prefatory clause does not limit or expand the scope of the operative clause." Pet. App. 26a (citation omitted). Instead, the majority held the exact opposite—namely, that if the purpose statement did *not* limit the scope of the operative clause, the purpose statement would be "unnecessary," "surplusage," and "superfluous." Pet. App. 19a-20a. The majority was mistaken.

1. As noted, the statute here commands that, when conditions satisfied here are met, the VA "shall award" contracts to veteran-owned small businesses. 38 U.S.C. §8127(d). That should have been the end of the matter. "[S]hall" is "the language of command" (*Escoe* v. *Zerbst*, 295 U.S. 490, 493 (1935)), and it "creates an obligation impervious to * * * discretion" (*Lexecon Inc.* v. *Milberg Weiss Bershad Hynes & Lerach*, 523 U.S. 26, 35 (1998); accord, *e.g.*, *Lopez* v. *Davis*, 531 U.S. 230, 241 (2001) (Congress's "use of a mandatory 'shall' * * * impose[s] discretionless obligations"); *Mach Mining, LLC* v. *E.E.O.C.*, 135 S. Ct. 1645, 1651 (2015) ("That language is mandatory"—"the word 'shall' admits of no discretion.")).

Unable to deny that "shall" is "mandatory language," the majority read "shall" out of the statute. Adopting the government's "interpretation," the court limited "shall" to situations where "the VA has decided," in its unbounded discretion, that it is "necessary" to "'meet[] the [VA's] goals'"—the "'purpose[]'" articulated in the statute's introductory clause. Pet. App. 17a (quoting 38 U.S.C. §8127(d)). According to the majority, this reading was required because "each word in a statute should be given effect." Pet. App. 19a. As the majority reasoned, interpreting "shall" as "shall" "assigns no substantive meaning" to the statute's stated "goals"; rather, "this goal-setting provision is itself made superfluous." Pet. App. 20a. "Because [Kingdomware's] plain meaning interpretation * * * reads the words 'for purposes of meeting the goals[']* * * out of the statute and makes the mandatory goal-setting statutory provision unnecessary, it cannot stand." *Ibid.*

2. In so holding, the majority inverted the proper approach to interpreting purpose statements, as laid

down by this Court. To be sure, there is a "general rule that every clause in a statute must have effect." *Heller*, 554 U.S. at 578 n.3. "But where the text of a clause itself indicates that it does not have operative effect, * * * a court has no license to make it do what it was not designed to do." *Ibid.* For that reason, it is a "settled principle of law" that a statute's "prefatory clause does not limit * * * the scope of the operative clause." *Id.* at 578 & n.3 (quotations omitted). Put simply, "operative provisions should be given effect as operative provisions, and prologues as prologues." *Ibid.*

By the government's lights, this fundamental principle applies only to prefatory language "[a]t the beginning of the statute" that "contain[s] the telltale 'whereas' language." Opp. 18-19. Not so. While "[e]xpressions of purpose are usually placed" in a preamble, "they do not have to be." A. Scalia & B. Garner, *Reading Law* 220 (2012). Indeed, in *Heller* itself, the purpose statement appeared in the same sentence as the operative language—not in a preamble—and did not use the word "whereas." An internal purpose statement can no more trump a clear statutory command than a purpose that appears in a preamble. Instead, in every case, the question is whether "the text of a clause itself indicates that it does not have operative effect, *such as* 'whereas' clauses in federal legislation." *Heller*, 554 U.S. at 578 n.3 (emphasis added). Regardless of where such a clause appears, "a court has no license to make it do what it was not designed to do." *Ibid.*

For its part, the government offers no principled reason why it should matter *where* a statement of purpose appears. And there is none. The text at issue here begins with the phrase, "*[f]or purposes of*

meeting the goals under subsection (a)." Because it "announces a purpose" for what follows, that clause is "a prefatory statement of purpose." *Heller*, 554 U.S. at 577. In other words, "the text of [the] clause itself indicates that it does not have operative effect." *Id.* at 578 n.3. Therefore, it has none.

Nor does this principle merely control when interpreting the Constitution, as in *Heller*. Just a year after *Heller*, this Court applied the same principle to a congressional joint resolution, which it referred to as a "statute." *Hawaii*, 556 U.S. at 173. In that case, the question was whether Congress "recognized that the native Hawaiian people ha[d] unrelinquished claims over [certain] lands." *Id.* at 172. As did the Federal Circuit here, the Hawaii Supreme Court held that the answer was "clear[]" "[b]ased on a plain reading" of the statute's purpose clauses. *Id.* at 175.

Relying on *Heller*, this Court rejected this reasoning: "As we recently explained in a different context, 'where the text of a clause itself indicates that it does not have operative effect * * * a court has no license to make it do what it was not designed to do." *Ibid.* (quoting *Heller*, 554 U.S. at 578 n.3). "Rather than focusing on the operative words of the law," the lower court in *Hawaii* "directed its attention to the * * * clause[] that preface[s]" them, leading it to a "conclusion [that] is wrong." *Ibid.*

So too here. As did the Hawaii Supreme Court, the Federal Circuit ignored that the VA's duties "depend[] entirely on the meaning of the statute's operative provision"—and "not on" any perceived legislative purpose that may or may not "fall within the prefatory clause." *Scialabba* v. *Cuellar de Osorio*, 134 S. Ct. 2191, 2215 n.3 (2014) (Roberts, C.J., joined by

Scalia, J., concurring in the judgment). This is hornbook law. As a leading treatise notes, clauses that merely "supply reasons" cannot "confer power or determine rights" and thus "may not be used to create ambiguity" about "the scope or effect of a statute." *Sutherland Statutes & Statutory Constr.* §§ 20:3, 20:12, 47.4 (7th ed. 2013). No matter how "narrow[]," preambles "shall not restrain" a statute's command. T. Sedgwick, *A Treatise on the Rules which Govern the Interpretation and Construction of Statutory and Constitutional Law* 43 (2d ed. 1874).

Although emphasized by Judge Reyna in dissent (Pet. App. 26a), the majority below did not even mention the longstanding principle that preambles "cannot enlarge or confer powers, nor control the words of the act, unless they are doubtful or ambiguous." *Yazoo & M.V.R. Co.* v. *Thomas*, 132 U.S. 174, 188 (1889). But as this Court has underscored, "[a]gencies exercise discretion only in the interstices created by statutory silence or ambiguity; they must always give effect to the unambiguously expressed intent of Congress." *Util. Air Regulatory Grp.* v. *EPA*, 134 S. Ct. 2427, 2445 (2014) (quotations omitted). Here, "the need to rewrite clear provisions of the statute should have alerted [the VA] that it had taken a wrong interpretive turn." *Id.* at 2446.

3. In contrast to the decision below, previous Federal Circuit panels, as well as other circuits and the GAO, have followed this Court's precedent.

Indeed, until this case, the Federal Circuit itself had recognized that "i[n] the case [of] a statute," Congress's "intent is best expressed in the operative provisions," and thus "specific operative provisions

cannot be controlled by general expressions of intent." *Atl. Richfield Co.* v. *United States*, 764 F.2d 837, 840 (Fed. Cir. 1985). "The operative provision[]" here should have "control[led] the outcome of this case" too. *Ibid.* After all, "[p]refatory language does not manufacture an ambiguity in the statute where there is none." *White* v. *United States*, 543 F.3d 1330, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

Other circuits, too, have held that even where a statute's "operative language" is "internally and irreconcilably inconsistent with the purpose * * * stated in its introductory clause" (and here it is not), it is still improper for a court to "depart[] from [its] literal meaning." *Parish Oil Co.* v. *Dillon Cos.*, 523 F.3d 1244, 1249, 1253 (10th Cir. 2008) (McConnell, J.). Notably, the "introductory clause" in *Parish* appeared—as it does here—in the same sentence as the statute's "operative language," and began with the phrase, "'[f]or the purpose of.'" *Id.* at 1247 (citation omitted). Yet that did not alter the conclusion that "the operative provision"—and not "its stated purpose"—"must be given effect." *Id.* at 1253, 1249.[2]

---

[2] See also *Ass'n of Am. R.R.* v. *Costle*, 562 F.2d 1310, 1316 (D.C. Cir. 1977) ("A preamble * * * is not an operative part of the statute and it does not enlarge or confer powers on administrative agencies or officers."); *Jurgensen* v. *Fairfax Cnty., Va.*, 745 F.2d 868, 885 (4th Cir. 1984) (same); *Nat'l Wildlife Found.* v. *Marsh*, 721 F.2d 767, 773 (11th Cir. 1983) ("Preambles to statutes do not impose substantive rights, duties or obligations"; and a statement of "the primary *goal* of the statute" does not alter the scope of a "requirement [that] is statutorily imposed."); *Florentine* v. *Church of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel*, 340 F.2d 239, 241-242 (2d Cir. 1965) ("what is clear from the text" of a statute "cannot be obscured by reliance on the ambiguous general purpose clause," which "must accede to the operative text").

Ultimately, what is at stake here is nothing less than the separation of powers. By "rely[ing] on [a] purpose clause[], rather than the concrete rules that [Congress] selected to achieve the stated ends," two unelected judges "bec[a]me effective lawmakers, bypassing the give-and-take of the legislative process." *City of Joliet, Ill.* v. *New West, L.P.*, 562 F.3d 830, 837 (7th Cir. 2009) (Easterbrook, J.). As the dissent below noted, by "relying entirely on prefatory language to second-guess Congress['s]" plain command, the majority "depart[ed] from [its] duty to enforce the proper interpretation of the statute regardless of [its] policy views." Pet. App. 22a.

The GAO likewise understood—and reaffirmed in 18 bid protests—that the phrase "for purposes of meeting the goals under subsection (a)" merely "explains the purpose for the mandate"; it "does not create an exception to the mandate." *In re Aldevra*, 2012 WL 860813, at *4 (Comp. Gen. Mar. 14, 2012). Accordingly, "nothing in the [2006] Act * * * provides the [VA] with discretion" to award a contract "without first determining whether the acquisition should be set aside" for veterans. *Aldevra*, 2011 WL 4826148, at *2.

The VA's decision to defy the GAO is extraordinary. In light of "the GAO's long experience and special expertise," its findings in "bid protest matters" have long been "give[n] due weight and deference," such that "an agency's decision to disregard a GAO recommendation is exceedingly rare." *CMS Contract Mgmt. Servs.* v. *United States*, 745 F.3d 1379, 1384 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quotations omitted). As the dissent noted, in 15 years, agencies have declined to follow the GAO only 10 times out of 1,099. Pet. 25a.

In sum, the decision below departs not only from this Court's binding precedent, but also from the Federal Circuit's own law, as well as the sound analysis of other circuits and the GAO. The Court should reverse.

III. The decision below is contrary to Congress's intent of maximizing economic opportunities for our Nation's veterans.

Reversal is also needed because the decision below wipes out a statutory benefit worth billions of dollars per year, which Congress has tried to establish three times. If the Court does not reverse, millions upon millions of veterans will have no avenue left for securing their rights to billions of dollars of critical benefits from the government they risked their lives to serve.

A. The VA's persistent refusal to obey Congress's command diverts from veterans up to $10 billion every year.

As official government reports show, the decision below empowers the VA to deny the statutory rights of nearly 2.5 million veteran-owned small businesses.[3] Indeed, as noted, between December 2011 and November 2012 alone, the GAO found that the VA violated the 2006 Act's mandatory set-aside provision 18 times. GAO Report to Congress, 2012 WL 5510908, at *1. Ultimately, the GAO decided that it would "no longer consider protests based only on the argument that the VA must consider setting

---

[3] Small Business Administration, *Veteran-owned Businesses and their Owners—Data from the Census Bureau's Survey of Business Owners*, at 1 (Mar. 2012), *available at* http://www.sba.gov/sites/default/files/393tot.pdf.

aside procurements for [veterans]" because the "decision in [this case], together with the VA's position on the meaning of th[e] statute, effectively means that protesters who continue to pursue these arguments will be unable to obtain meaningful relief." *Kingdomware Techs.—Reconsideration*, 2012 WL 6463498, at *2 (Comp. Gen. Dec. 13, 2012).

The lost opportunities for veterans are enormous. For example, the VA "faced substantial criticism" after it "made multiple awards to nonveteran offerors on an unrestricted basis"—in violation of the 2006 Act—for a single "multibillion dollar" procurement. J.T. Williams, *Veterans First? VA Should Give Vet Contracting Program Priority*, 47-WTR Procurement Law. 1, 23 (2012). Nor was this unusual. As it did in this case, the VA routinely procures goods and services directly through the Federal Supply Schedule ("FSS")—a network of large, government-wide contractors with notoriously few veteran-owned small businesses—before even considering whether to apply the Rule of Two.

In just one year, the VA used the FSS for $3.26 billion—over one-fifth—of its $16 billion in annual procurements. Kathleen Miller, *Dispute Simmers Between VA and Veteran-Owned Businesses*, Wash. Post, 2011 WLNR 23483727 (Nov. 14, 2011). Yet a mere 13 percent of those FSS purchases—worth $436 million—went to veteran-owned small businesses. *Ibid.* Thus, the VA's unlawful procurements from the FSS without first conducting market research potentially deprived veteran-owned small-business contractors of up to nearly $3 billion in government contracts in a single year alone. *Ibid.* Indeed, according to the VA itself, up to *60 percent* of $18 billion in annual procurements use the FSS—in which case vet-

erans are being deprived of the opportunity to compete for contracts totaling $10 billion. Pet. 35.

This loss can be traced directly to the VA's illegal reliance on the FSS at a time when almost 2.5 million veteran-owned small businesses stand ready to compete with FSS vendors. To stop the VA from steering billions of dollars in contracting opportunities away from veterans, the Court should reverse.

B. Confirming Kingdomware's plain reading of the statute, Congress strove to overcome the VA's recalcitrance by strengthening the law *three times*.

Finally, Kingdomware's plain reading of the statute is powerfully underscored by Congress's decision to address the issues here three times between 1999 and 2006. For years, agencies failed to heed earlier statutes, which were merely aspirational. *Supra* at 2-3. "Continuing the trend started with" those statutes, and focusing on the VA, Congress thus "amend[ed] the permissive language of the set aside" provisions for veterans "to make these practices mandatory." Sherman, *supra*, at 135. Consider the contrasting language:

- **2003 Act:** "[A] contracting officer ***may*** award contracts on the basis of competition restricted to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans if the contracting officer has a reasonable expectation" that the Rule of Two is met. 15 U.S.C. §657f(b) (emphasis added).
- **2006 Act:** "[A] contracting officer of the Department ***shall*** award contracts on the basis of competition restricted to small business concerns owned and controlled by

> veterans if the contracting officer has a reasonable expectation" that the Rule of Two is met. 38 U.S.C. §8127(d) (emphasis added).

"The evolution of these statutory provisions supplies further evidence that Congress intended" the 2006 Act to be mandatory. *Russello* v. *United States*, 464 U.S. 16, 23 (1983). In comparing "the predecessor statute" to the 2006 Act, the VA and the Federal Circuit should have "discern[ed] Congress's intent" from the "crucial fact" that it "used the word 'shall' rather than the word 'may.'" *United States* v. *Rodgers*, 461 U.S. 677, 706 (1983).

Instead, the VA and the Federal Circuit concluded that Congress had enacted yet another "discretion[ary]" law (Pet. App. 17a), ignoring that "a change in phraseology" in statutory language "creates a presumption of a change in intent" (*Crawford* v. *Burke*, 195 U.S. 176, 190 (1904)). But "Congress would not have used such different language * * * without thereby intending a change of meaning." *Ibid.* This was Congress's third attempt to assist veterans; yet the VA continues to resist the congressional will. This Court should restore these critical benefits and thereby carry out Congress's unambiguous intent in passing the 2006 Act.

CONCLUSION

What is perhaps most frustrating for veterans is that it is not clear *why* the VA—an agency specifically created to *protect* their interests—is treating the 2006 Act's mandatory set-aside as optional. Regardless, in following the VA's lead, the Federal Circuit majority ignored—and the government here continues to ignore—the plain language of the 2006 Act, Congress's labors that led to that language, and our

Nation's tradition of advancing the veteran's cause. It also ignored this Court's binding precedent favoring veterans in statutory interpretation, and emphasizing the primacy of operative language. In so doing, the majority enabled the VA to deprive veterans of billions of dollars in vital contracting opportunities.

For all of these reasons, and those stated by Kingdomware and the forceful dissent below, the judgment of the Federal Circuit should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted.

LINDA T. COBERLY
Winston & Strawn LLP
35 W. Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 558-5600

ANDREW C. NICHOLS
Counsel of Record
STEFFEN N. JOHNSON
EIMERIC REIG-PLESSIS
Winston & Strawn LLP
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 282-5000
anichols@winston.com

AUGUST 2015